GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
URBAN DEVELOPMENT
LOK SABHA

UNSTARRED QUESTION NO:1091
ANSWERED ON:02.03.2016
Workshop for Smart Cities
Scindia Shri Jyotiraditya Madhavrao

Will the Minister of URBAN DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

Will the Minister of URBAN DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Government has identified gaps/deficiencies in the Smart City proposal;

(b) if so, the details of the gaps identified and also the names of the proposed smart cities;

(c) whether the Government proposes to organise a workshop to guide these cities to improve their smart city plans so as to bridge these identified gaps/deficiencies; and

(d) if so, the details thereof?

Answer

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT
(SHRI BABUL SUPRIYO)

(a)& (b): After announcing the 20 winning cities the remaining cities were divided into two tracks. In the fast-track, 23 cities located in 23 States/UTs in which none of the potential smart cities were able to come in the list of 20 winning cities, have been provided an opportunity to upgrade their proposal and submit by 15th April, 2016. The observations of the Panel of Experts have been communicated to States/Cities and copies are at Annexure-I. The remaining 54 cities have to participate in the Round 2 of the Smart City Challenge process.

The generic observations to revisit/revise their proposals have been sent to the Cities and are also available on Mission's website (www.smartcities.gov.in).

(c) & (d): In order to guide these cities to improve/upgrade their Smart City Proposals, Ministry of Urban Development had organised a one day Workshop at Vigyan Bhavan, New Delhi on 22 February, 2016 which was attended by Principal Secretary (UD)/ Municipal Commissioners or representatives of 20 winning cities and 23 fast track cities. During the workshop, a Panel discussion was held on convergence opportunities for the cities. Moreover, three breakout sessions were held to guide the 23 cities to revise and upgrade their SCPs with urban experts, professionals and handholding agencies.

ANNEXURE I
ANNEXURE REFERRED TO IN REPLY OF PART (a) of
THE LOK SABHA UNSTARRRED QUESTION NO.1091 FOR 02.03.2016

Warangal SCP Observations

City level Criteria
â€¢ Specific examples with details about the measures taken need to be mentioned in case of transportation, water availability and reduction in NRW
â€¢ Warangal has mentioned in SCP that city is safe and is currently placed in scenario 3 under safety and security smart city feature as part of self-assessment. Basis for assessment needs to be substantiated with crime statistics for last 3-5 years and public perception surveys etc., as mere provision of CCTV surveillance, police patrolling, additional teams for women doesn''t ensure better safety index to any city. Initiatives to shift from current scenario to advance scenario in safety include surveillance, city services monitoring which are not any value addition to existing measures and the list also include construction of smart library which is not detailed further.
â€¢ There are contradictory statements w.r.t energy availability and reduction in outages - Scheduled outages as per city profile and self assessment column I are now reduced to zero whereas in self assessment column H, there exist scheduled outages of 3-4 outages once a week or once in fortnight for maintenance purposes.
â€¢ Based on information provided in SCP in various sections it is evident that housing and inclusiveness smart city feature in Warangal is currently limited to scenario 2. Self-assessment has presented the case as scenario with no indicators/basis for assessment.
â€¢ SWOT analysis is weakly structured with emphasis on reporting the current status and missing out on some of the key strategic areas which need to be thought of to achieve the SCP vision considering the self assessment shows 10 smart city features in scenario 2 and 7 in scenario 1. (for example threats is limited to environmental degradation of natural resources)
â€¢ The six focus areas identified need to be detailed with specific strategies, as SCP is limited to a combination of status reporting, issues identification, and broad activities like smart parking provision (is this for cars/two wheelers or auto rickshaws?), value added

industrial base (which is not self explanatory), tourism based activities and improvement of National Highway (what would be implementation strategy?).
â€¢ Environmental Management is completely overlooked in the strategic focus although it is the only threat as per SWOT. Strategic blueprint for next 5-10 years development is presented as more of a infrastructure development plan than strategic plan.
â€¢ Confusion in defining goals to achieve a vision. Ten goals include six strategic areas instead of activities to achieve vision envisaged.
â€¢ 5 lakh count for citizen engagement extent in shaping vision and goals? what are the metrics?
â€¢ Citizen engagement is not inclusive and not comprehensive as some of the major primary stakeholders to achieve the SCP vision are not included in the stakeholders groups which includes slum residents and tourists.
â€¢ Mapping of priorities from citizen engagement onto vision formulation is not self explanatory and needs detailing. (priorities among different stakeholders groups is varying how was this streamlined?)
â€¢ Use of words such as Resilient City without qualify or quantify
â€¢ Self assessment needs to be substantiated with basis for assessment (column I)

Area Based Development
â€¢ Retrofitting was chosen as nature of intervention prior to selection of area taking into account its scale/level of impact (larger area, bridging critical infrastructure gaps, efficiency in delivery of civic services) but the delineation of ABD area boundary and location of ABD project area have limited this scale of impact.
â€¢ Considering Warangal city is a HRIDAY and AMRUT city and allocation/plans related to heritage, tourism infrastructure and basic infrastructure are key components under these mission respectively, the rationale for delineation of retrofitting area boundary in Central Warangal is not comprehensive in nature.
â€¢ Key components and smart characteristics of the ABD proposal are not mapped to site conditions, requirement and are just listed. (eg. NMT corridor along Nallah includes STP related details)
â€¢ ABD project area has a large number of heritage and tourism assets and ABD SWOT analysis discusses this potential. However the eventual proposal seems to be totally focused on the redevelopment site. Not sure how the redevelopment proposed responds to the tourism potential and infrastructure that was highlighted earlier.
â€¢ ABD proposal presents the project as a real estate focused project rather than a light house project.
â€¢ Land need to acquired under Town Planning Scheme for mixed use development, how is the redevelopment of 14.2 ha site critical to the ABD project? and risk mitigation strategy suggest to compensate at market rate to the landowners who do not want to party to such scheme, what is the rationale for this process?
â€¢ Except the bus terminal project the proposal does not seem to focus on how the tourism potential can be fully extracted through smart interventions, tourism support infrastructure or even through strategically programming the redevelopment intervention.
â€¢ Success of the proposed retrofitting of the central core will depend on how it is connected with the wider road/transportation network of the Warangal but the proposal does not seem to recognize this.
â€¢ Resentment from area residents during removal of encroachments can be a potential barrier to pedestrian pathway which is a key component, how is this addressed? [no provision of alternative space (as mentioned in risk mitigation) in redevelopment site concept layout plan]
â€¢ Disagreement from residential property associations towards installation of solar power projects could lead to failure of city"s target of renewable energy as an alternative source of energy supply, readiness is evident from SCP.
â€¢ How does the robust IT connectivity and digitization component proposed in ABD transforms the area into safe and smart?
â€¢ What is the current scenario of on street parking? include details of type of vehicles parked, duration etc. to arrive at the need for multi level parking.

Pan City Proposal
â€¢ Pan city proposal envisages provision of ITS would create an opportunity for modal shift from private to public transport, metrics related to which mode of private transport and perception studies could be useful in establishing it.
â€¢ An analysis of city profile as per pan city profile indicates sub optimal efforts to achieve instant electronic access to the information people need, services required by them and levels of interaction with city government officials they expect. Self Assessment and City Profile present a contradictory scenario with Warangal in scenario 3 under ICT enabled government services.
â€¢ How does provision of ITS help in increasing equity (distributing benefits to all sections of people by providing access to economic, education and health activities) as mentioned in SCP?
â€¢ How does the Warangal One App mitigate the challenges of lack of internet penetration in the city? Please elaborate and propose components
â€¢ High mobile penetration rate in Warangal doesn"t indicate access to mobile with internet and incidence of smart phone, How does Warangal One App address the challenge of inclusivity with nearly 42 percent slum population?
â€¢ Mitigation strategy for lack of communication infrastructure is not clear and needs detailing about aspects of affordability of user groups.
â€¢ Convergence with national or state level initiatives is not shown for pan city proposals, this section needs to be strengthened.

Implementation Plan
â€¢ Provision of basic infrastructure is with convergence from AMRUT and service levels are expected to improve pan city, revision of user charges is limited to retrofitting area, what is the value addition SCP expected to bring in within ABD area?
â€¢ Smart parking is expected to bring in 14 Crore per year, modal share indicate 1 percent car and 16 percent two wheelers, who would be the users?
â€¢ Reduction in O&M costs by 50 percent is expected with increase in ULB tax base, land use breakup of ABD area indicates only 23 percent in total under the residential, commercial, mixed use and industrial, Please elaborate.
â€¢ Success of redevelopment of bus station as a Public Private Partnership project is a potential barrier to SCP implementation considering the fact that this project component along with parking are major projects in terms of financial allocation, visual impact and bearing on quality of traffic and transportation measures in the area.
â€¢ Location of nearly 5 places of public prominence in the area based development project area can impact the continuousimplementation of retrofitting activities as the footprint of these places of interest is more than 50 percent of project area,

mitigation and institutional collaboration strategies need to be defined.
â€¢ Out of the 14 major sub components of the area based development proposal 9 are anticipated to be completed in the year 2019 or later. This can have an adverse impact on implementation of the proposal for various reasons which include - national urban missions completion period is 2019, state government in Telangana is expected to have general elections during 2019. Change in institutional mechanisms can bring in the revisions in funds flow and scheme level changes there by delaying the implementation of the projects.
â€¢ Citizens interest in the project can also be withdrawn with long period of implementation and no visible impact in the area and doesn"t suffice the underlying principle of mission to replicate
â€¢ Indicators and activities/components needs to be strengthened and to the extent possible need to be mapped with self assessment for effective for implementation of SCP
â€¢ Nomination of Private shareholders directors in SPV constitution of board?

Financial Plan
â€¢ Figures are confusing at different places
â€¢ The financing plan is very sketchy and requires more realistic detailing.
â€¢ Concessionaire for redevelopment of existing bus stand will derive income from bus parking charges, car parking charges, rent of commercial properties, etc.?

Chandigarh SCP Observations
CITY PROFILE
â€¢ SWOT analysis is inadequate and confusing.
â€¢ While achievements in rehabilitating slums have been identified as a strength, their presence or reasons for their presence does not feature as a weakness.
â€¢ Traffic congestion, inadequate public transport and road safety have been identified as key issues despite a well defined 7-level road network that includes sector roads, house-access roads, shopping streets, cycle tracks and pedestrian paths providing safe mobility to pedestrians.
â€¢ Water supply coverage is 100% with per capita supply as 252 lpcd with 80% being sourced as surface water from neighbouring states. While the city struggles with 26% NRW losses, newer projects for augmenting the water sources are being planned.
â€¢ Neighbouring cities of Panchkula and Mohali are upcoming IT destinations attracting investment, finance and service industry. Proposals for connecting Chandigarh with Mohali and Panchkula with metro-rail are underway. This has been identified as an opportunity as well as a threat.
â€¢ The strategic focus and blueprint for the city proposes to leverage ICT solutions to improve services. However ICT solutions are already employed in most of the sectors of water - supply, SWM, etc.
â€¢ The visions and goals for the city fail to consider the fact that Chandigarh is the first planned city of modern India which appears to have been merely reduced to conservation of architectural heritage.

AREA-BASED PROPOSAL
â€¢ The ABD includes retrofitting of 1000 acres of area in the centre of the city which includes major city markets proposes a general makeover for the "heart" of the city. The proposal identifies the key problems/concerns of the area which includes the re-use of around 2 million sq.ft of unused floor space in Sector 17 but fails to address it.
â€¢ Similarly, the 350 acres of greenfield development in Sector 43 has not been detailed.
â€¢ Also, the proposal for the greenfield development requires approval from the Ministry of Home Affairs to transfer the land to the SPV who would sell developed plots and levy taxes and user charges for maintaining the development.
â€¢ Also the High Powered Steering Committee has also resolved that the SPV will be empowered to use these lands as collateral to raise funds for development initiatives and post development sell the plots for repaying loans.
â€¢ As mentioned in Annexure 8.4, heritage regulations shall specify the nature and extent of interventions to be permitted by the Chandigarh Heritage Conservation Committee.

PAN CITY PROPOSAL
â€¢ The Pan City proposal seems to cover all services. However presently, only a few (approximately 50%) of the departments provide online services. The need and advantage of integration of all services needs to be provided.
â€¢ The intelligent safety and mobility solution will need an integrated approach for various departments such as the police, traffic management and public transport. It seems a bit ambitious.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN:
â€¢ Key components identified in the ABD (Q11) do not match with components mentioned in the Implementation Plan.
â€¢ Except the greenfield development and re-use of 2 million sq.ft. of unused office space, all other components would be achieved in 2 years time (short term).
â€¢ The intelligent safety and mobility solution for pan-city is proposed to be achieved within 16 months. This seems to be an ambitious target.
â€¢ Most of the key components are proposed to be implemented through PPP contracts with the SPV. While this works well for key components of the ABD, PPP arrangements for Greenfield development could risk the development being a developer driven exercise.
â€¢ While the implementation of the pan city proposal for intelligent safety and mobility solution involves a number of diverse agencies/departments/parastatal bodies like the police, traffic police, fire, health, municipal corporation, transport, etc, their representation in the SPV or their inclusion in the High Powered Steering Committee is not indicated for detailing and accepting the proposal.

Lucknow SCP Observations

City Profile

â€¢ Strategic focus of the city, mentions four dimensions, which are not derived from SWOT or from citizen's engagement. Eg. Environmental management and financial viability have not been mentioned as a concern earlier at all.
â€¢ Traffic and transportation and mobility issues have been identified by 58% of citizens engaged with but it is not one of the 4 dimensions of strategic focus.

Area Based Development: (Retrofitting of 719 acres merging old and new Lucknow)
â€¢ Description of the retrofitting ADP mentions multiple high-density areas with poor services and slums. However no details on how to include this in an amalgamation of old and new development plan is given.
â€¢ Every map for ABD shows the development interventions in the new Lucknow area- no mention of how old Lucknow is to be developed in the proposal is given.
â€¢ Generic risks are same for both ADP and PCP.
â€¢ Art City to Smart City marks land pooling based residential redevelopment in the old city area- but it does not give any details in the write-up nor is it mentioned in essential features of ABP.
â€¢ Convergence Implementation very sketchy- no details provided.
â€¢ Is the SPV to be taken as a success factor? Creation of SPV is an essential component of SCP implementation.

Pan City Proposal: (Integrated Smart and Sustainable Mobility Project framed by broader ICT and mobility strategy)
â€¢ The rollout of the PC plan will requires creating a platform for a coherent IT system as well as integrating multiple sectors in an on-line mode, many of whom are yet to function in that mode. This operationalisation lacks detail.
â€¢ Risks are not plan specific- a repetition of those listed in ADP.
â€¢ Public transport safeties being one of the key components of smart mobility, relevant stakeholder representations are not reflected in the High Powered Steering Committee.

Implementation Plan
â€¢ Probable completion dates not very definitive.
â€¢ Key components of ADP (Pg 27) do not match with components mentioned in Implementation plan. (Pg 62)
â€¢ Most of the components in implementation plan from base line to target to be achieved are significantly ambitious given the timelines mentioned.

Financial Plan
â€¢ The financial plan gives 2 figures of total SCP in two places, while the total of INR 1551.53 crores matches in two places, the itemized costs do not add up. The resource plan also does not give a correct totaling of the revenue sources in one place. These discrepancies are seen in pages 77, 81 and 82.
â€¢ ADP proposal and PC proposal are giving different figures in different places.
â€¢ Project cost listing in Annexure 3 with cost break up to show financial sources do not match the figures of individual components from previous pages.

New Town-Kolkata SCP Observations

City Profile
â€¢ In the SWOT analysis, certain aspects/facilities listed as strengths are mentioned as not economically viable due to less population using the facilities. Eg operational sewerage treatment plants.
â€¢ Planned services/activities are mentioned as both strengths and opportunities.
â€¢ Investment dependent on other central or state departments have been shown as a threat to hinder efforts of city administration in attracting investment.
â€¢ Feedback from citizens engagement and their prioritized aspirations have not been elaborated upon nor has it been mentioned how those have been applied in strategic goals or city vision.

Area Based Development
â€¢ The area dimensions of the ADP are not mentioned in the document-reference is only with sector numbers.
â€¢ Basic information on population, area, density and other existing figures are not mentioned.
â€¢ The plan talks about a very ambitious 'all replicable smart solutions in the chosen area' without giving much information on ground reality.
â€¢ Generic risks are same for both ADP and PCP.
â€¢ Convergence Implementation not detailed.

Pan City Proposal: (Intelligent Government Services)
â€¢ ICT enabled single point citizen service delivery system involves very high level of online activities, which needs to be integrated with present set-up. The enabling mechanisms are mostly in planning stage. Hence the plan sounds ambitious.
â€¢ The entire plan is based on technology intervention but technology choice has been identified as a risk both at implementation stage and sustainability post-implementation.
â€¢ Success factors are finding the right technical partner for implementation and ensuring digital literacy of the citizens- both of which have not been elaborated upon.

Implementation Plan
â€¢ Initiation of drone based monitoring of all civic services has a very ambitious timeline of a year (March 2017).
â€¢ Complete system integration for enabling the command and control centre involves implementation support from technology partners within a timeline, which is not very realistic.
â€¢ Risks shown in both plans are on capacity of staff for implementation, delivery and post-implementation sustainability of the smart proposal, strengthening the ambitiousness of the initiatives.

Financial Plan
â€¢ The financial plan needs a re-look as same figures in multiple places do not match.
â€¢ The cost figures for Area Based and Pan City proposals in page 77 (itemized cost) and 81 (are different.
â€¢ Detailing of resource generation and itemized costs in descriptive listing are very confusing.
â€¢ The detailed financial operating plan worksheet is not a part of this plan.

Panaji SCP Observatories

CITY LEVEL CRITERIA
â€¢ While the proposal provides information on various service aspects, it would be useful to provide quantified service indicators wherever possible. The issues or levels of service related to transport for instance are not well defined.
â€¢ The overall flow of the initial sections and linkage with strategies and vision is clear. Not much work needed in this section.

AREA BASED DEVELOPMENT
â€¢ A large number of the interventions are in the nature of urban design or beautification interventions. While this will no doubt benefit the area given the tourism potential, its specific relevance under 'smart city' plan has not been adequately justified. It is recommended that the linkage of such interventions with sustainability and economic development be explored and elaborated more strongly in the proposal.
â€¢ Several of these beautification interventions are also heavily dependent on completion of one or more infrastructure projects (as mentioned in annexure 3). Given that these interventions form the backbone of the entire proposal, this is probably an area of high risk.
â€¢ Annexure 3 does not provide adequate spatial detailing (at least conceptual plans) of interventions such as integrated urban water management (including waste water and storm water), basic infrastructure and pedestrianization of certain sections.
â€¢ Although improvements in physical environments of potentially tourist places in the vicinity of urban poor localities (mala lake area) can be expected to indirectly benefit the urban poor too, the linkage is quite weak. This aspect of inclusiveness will need to be strengthened.
â€¢ In the sections on convergence, only details of works being undertaken under other missions has been stated. No details are available for the actual components to be undertaken through SCM for water supply, sewerage etc. Since substantial funds under SCM are earmarked to improve these same services, these details are critical to understand the specific value proposed to be added to the outcomes of the other missions.

PAN CITY SOLUTIONS
â€¢ While the transport system package is well thought through, the municipal services package attempts to fit in various services in a piecemeal manner. While the SWM sub-component is relatively better worked out, components such as water meters and power grid seem loose and not integrated into the overall package.
â€¢ The second package may therefore be revised so as to strengthen interlinkages within the sub-components or else the city may consider focusing only on SWM in far more detail and improve coverage of SWM aspects if needed.

Pasighat SCP Observations

CITY PROFILE:
â€¢ SWOT analysis is very weak with a lot of repetitions. Particularly the weaknesses and threats.
â€¢ The city profiling does not provide required information. For example, the section on housing conditions does not provide any information regarding the process and time taken for approvals., or property tax collection details.
â€¢ The proposals claim 60% citizens engaged in the process of drafting the proposal and at the same time mentions 100% coverage of households for surveys.

AREA-BASED PROPOSAL:
â€¢ The area based proposal has two components retrofitting and redevelopment. For redevelopment a total area of 134 acres has been identified. However, the plan does not specifically detail out the redevelopment process, that is, what will be demolished, what will be retained, what will be redensified.
â€¢ The proposal discusses the reason for undertaking redevelopment as being the need for redensification and also mentions the dilapidated conditions of structures which are more than 30 years old. There is no assessment of heritage/aesthetic value or character of the existing development.
â€¢ The redevelopment proposal needs to be detailed to indicate number of existing and proposed houses.
â€¢ The plans and images of the existing and proposed development indicate relocation of the administrative centre itself.

PAN CITY PROPOSAL
â€¢ While street lightening has been identified as a necessity, the lack of basic infrastructure seems to have been highlighted in the plan. In this situation, the choice of pan-city solution of e-governance and digital services could be questionable specially with low awareness and know-how among citizens.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN
â€¢ Phase 2 of the redevelopment project is proposed to be completely financed by sale of land developed in phase 1.
â€¢ The timeline indicates that the DPR preparation for the retrofitting and redevelopment components of the area based development would be completed by the 3rd quarter of 2016-17. It also suggests that the implementation of all the components of area based development would begin in the 2nd quarter of 2016-17. This seems to be a mis-match.
â€¢ The timeline indicates the completion dates of all components to be March 2019 and beyond. The scenarios that identify short term, medium term and long term activities is not clear.
â€¢ The concessionaire/JV partner has already been identified for implementation of each component.

FINANCIAL PLAN:
â€¢ With the Pasighat Municipal Council being just 2.5 years old with a weak revenue generation and no surplus funds. The cost of O and M is hence not known.
â€¢ Financial plan needs further detailing to indicate resource allocation for each component.

Dharamshala SCP Observations

City level Criteria
â€¢ Planning principles such as integrated and holistic planning and inclusive planning should not be listed as strategic focus areas. Focus areas should rather be public transportation and NMT , similar to environmental sustainability and resilience which is already listed.
â€¢ All listed goals have strategies, no measurable (quantitative and qualitative) outcomes
â€¢ Goal 2 City For All lists zero waste, sustainable water management and sustainable energy as strategies. They seem out of place for the goal.
â€¢ Goal 3 Climate and Disaster Resilience lists optimizing densities for resilient urban growth. What are the densities that are being targeted - densification or diffusion is not clear.
â€¢ The city declared outreach and active engagement of at-least 80% of citizens. It is doubtful that this target was reached if broadcast through radio is excluded.
â€¢ Citizen engagement process describes citizens were asked to submit entries for logo and brand name. In Annexure 4, the minutes of meeting lists TERI being requested to submit 2-3 versions of logo and more versions of brand name. Confusion about who"s logo and brand name was selected as final one.
â€¢ Door to door surveys and 3 Smart City marches had 200 people. Quite low. On the other hand 8000 street plays (that is absurdly high)
â€¢ Floating tourist population which is about 30 times the permanent population have been excluded in solicitation of inputs
â€¢ Self-Assessment needs to be relooked at, to quantify the various existing levels of service. For eg, in Compact, the city is assessed at level 3 when the overall density within the urban boundary is projected at 38 pph (very low) in 2025. Similarly, the city is assessed at level 3 for IT connectivity while Official Information city profiles show only 13% of the households have internet connectivity at home. Similarly verify the assessment for sanitation.

Area Based Development
â€¢ Summarize idea - explains ABD not what ABD proposal of Dharamshala is
â€¢ 310 acres of retrofitting and redevelopment but does not articulate which parts (spatially) and how many acres will be fitted under each of the model.
â€¢ Selection of site - no explaining criteria. Problem areas of the city are listed and then suddenly the site is listed. What were the alternatives
â€¢ The ABD site is described as built up, compact (no quantification), dense (what densities) around nodes (which nodes?).
â€¢ Key components too general. Please look at Pune proposal to be specific number driven or geography driven. Key component No 6 development of precincts as places talks about 3 places.Kotwaali bazaar and Mcleodganj chowk have shown to retain vehicular traffic on very narrow streets. Wouldn"t complete pedestrianization or limited access to light vehicles (e-rickshaws) make sense for place making?
â€¢ Smart Urban form emphasizes Urban-Nature-Culture connect. Yet no greenway as been listed running through the entire length of the area.
â€¢ Convergence has ring roads and parking areas ? Also convergence documentation is missing for the ring roads and parking areas.
â€¢ Convergence documents show projects already started(ropeway, parks plaza and viewing decks etc) and fully funded under existing budgets? What is the convergence being sought for? Needs more details
â€¢ Top three risks are correlated.
â€¢ Measurable Impact too general so doubtful if it can be measured(Please refer to Pune plan)

Pan City Proposal
â€¢ City observatory but Official information lists city not connected to State Data Center as of 2012. Please verify
â€¢ What were the top priority areas as ranked by the citizens for pan city issues? The proposal mentions mobility as the first one and ineffective management as second. How does City Observatory tie the top ranked issues.
â€¢ City observatory does not ensure inclusion, on the contrary might perpetuate exclusion due to lack of data interpretation and technology skills in the citizens. Need to detail out how inclusion will be achieved.
â€¢ Cities that have data driven governance have evolved over a longer time with established rules coordination amongst city agencies to collect, integrate and for periodically update the civic data. Dharamshala has only recently been accorded the Municipal Corporation and so needs to detail out at the minimum
o The initial planning areas of data collection and dissemination that will be housed under the city observatory, for eg 50 datasets that can be rolled out in Year 1 and so on.
o The agencies responsible for data collection, maintenance and updates to the city observatory.
o The coordination and funding mechanisms for the same.
o Signatories to the agreement for sharing the responsibilities of a city observatory.
These above details are missing.
â€¢ Convergence agenda is very weak. See the previous bullet point.
â€¢ Lack of internet penetration affected scale of citizen engagement. Yet, if urban data observatory is the city wide proposal, the administration should have demonstrated the role of ICT during the citizen engagement process

Implementation Plan
â€¢ Ring road and tunnel proposed for Smart City Funding and the costs are grouped with other mobility initiatives. Possibly has to be removed from under SCP.

â€¢ Some of the ABD projects such as ropeway reported for convergence are already under execution. How do they get included under convergence when they have existing budgets.
â€¢ PCP indicators are very general. Need to be detailed out.
â€¢ All timelines need to be brought upto 2019.
â€¢ All India Radio endorsing commitment to DharamshalaSCP . Don"t understand the relevance

Financial Plan
â€¢ Ring road has shown to need 175 crores out of which 1 crore is shown to be sourced from convergence. Another 202 crores are shown for tunnel with no convergence. Similarly development of parking lots proposed. These need to be relooked at , for inclusion in SCP, they should rather be in AMRUT.
â€¢ No data on how many kms of roads or how many intersections to be retrofitted , even though it is the largest component in the resource requirement.
â€¢ More clarity needed on individual convergence (Refer to Pune plan)
â€¢ PCP budget in Annexure 3.10 needs component details.
â€¢ Details on O&M expenses lacking (Refer to Pune plan)

Faridabad SCP Observations

City level Criteria
â€¢ Inadequate public transportation which is confused as a weakness and then termed as adequate at different places in the proposal
â€¢ Confusion in SWOT - Strengths and weaknesses are intrinsic , Opportunities and Threats are external, Keep getting duplicated (Strengths as Opportunities, Weaknesses as Threats)
â€¢ Citizen engagement outcomes (such as priority areas) are not listed. Currently elected house of representatives is dissolved
â€¢ Strategic focus is loose and not informed either by SWOT (badly done) or citizen engagement (no outcomes mapped)
â€¢ TOD along NH-2 (TOD along an expressway?), later feeder buses from NH2 (expressway) ?
â€¢ Self Assessment is very confusing , need to essentially pick numbers not describe what the current status is.
â€¢ No mention of one of the most polluted cities in India
â€¢ Landfill site is denoted as "Municipal Solid Waste Plant", need details of segregation and treatment if any
â€¢ Use of words such as Resilient City without qualifying or quantifying

Area Based Development
â€¢ Retrofitting proposal excludes slums and high density informal cluster (similar to villages in Delhi)
â€¢ Summarize idea - explains ABD not what ABD proposal of Faridabad is
â€¢ Badhkal lake is disconnected from ABD but the proposal says it will be revived . No details
â€¢ Selection of site - no explaining criteria
â€¢ Essential features copied word to word from SCP without being specific to location
â€¢ Convergence extent and breadth not explained at all (compare with Pune plan)
â€¢ Convergence Implementation has no details
â€¢ Risks not identified - very generic repeated again in PCP
â€¢ Success Factors - SPV is identified as one, its a requirement not a success factor

Pan City Proposal
â€¢ Summarize idea - explains PCP not what PCP proposal of Faridabad is
â€¢ Technology provider already selected? Planners termed as doctors of city
â€¢ Improving connectivity within city through ITS and CCTV? Not explaining how
â€¢ Risk factors repeated

Implementation Plan
â€¢ Likely date of completion not specific
â€¢ Pan city is bunched and un-bunched as per convenience - no staged completion
â€¢ PERT Chart is highly confusing
â€¢ Convergence with other agencies - no specific roles defined
â€¢ PPP - Partners already selected?

Financial Plan
â€¢ Details needed in resource generation, O&M recovery
â€¢ No evidence of VGF commitments from state government
â€¢ Municipal Bonds (BBB- rated according to Official information, but SCP says not yet rated)

Raipur SCP Observations

CITY LEVEL CRITERIA
â€¢ While the proposal provides information on various service aspects, it would be useful to provide quantified service indicators wherever possible.
â€¢ The overall flow of the initial sections and linkage with strategies and vision is clear. Not much work needed in this section.

AREA BASED DEVELOPMENT
â€¢ One of the major concerns with regards to the final proposal is that it has ended up as a set of projects, rather than a comprehensive set of planning interventions that impact the entire area.

â€¢ Most interventions proposed are piecemeal and may not have a substantial impact as an area strategy. For example, the walking street or introduction of e-rickshaws is restricted to a really small road stretch and it is not clear how this is justified as an area level smart strategy.
â€¢ The individual market redevelopments have also become isolated real estate projects in the absence of a consolidated strategy for management of commercial activity in the entire precinct. This is particularly important since there are large commercial street stretches throughout the area.
â€¢ It is recommended that the components of ABD be detailed further to justify the costs provided in the financial section. For example, the nature of interventions and costs associated with pedestrianization and e-rickshaws, or development of public spaces is not clear.
â€¢ In the sections on convergence, only details of works being undertaken under other missions has been stated. No details are available for the actual components to be undertaken through SCM under missions such as AMRUT for water supply, sewerage etc. Since funds under SCM are earmarked to improve these services, these details are critical to understand the specific value added to the outcomes of these other missions.
â€¢ Although pollution has been mentioned as the largest risk (also identified strongly in the SWOT), this finds very little expression in the actual proposal. The installation of air quality monitoring system at one junction seems piecemeal.
â€¢ Details of slum redevelopment projects are not provided − number of households covered, location, number of sites, nature of redevelopment proposed etc.
â€¢ Although the proposal has several good elements and tries to address almost all features of smart development, these have remained piecemeal projects and have not been integrated under an area level change strategy. As such the impact of the area as a lighthouse project, and replicability of the strategies employed therein for inducing change across the city remains quite limited.

PAN CITY SOLUTIONS
â€¢ Interventions for traffic management will need the buy-in of traffic police department. No documents are available for confirming that the department has concurred with the proposed solution.

Financial Plan
â€¢ The total proposal is for Rs. 2431.94 crores. In Q. 38, the details of funds available from different sources have not been given. The resource plan needs to be detailed accordingly so that feasibility of raising funds from these sources can be worked out. The same will also have to synchronize with fall back options.

Implementation Plan
The current proposal does not tie the various proposed sub-projects into a coherent whole.

Bhagalpur SCP Observations

CITY LEVEL CRITERIA
â€¢ It is recommended to include service levels or indicators so as to provide a clear picture of the level of services − missing in the transport section.
â€¢ Key strategy that emerged during SWOT was to capitalize on distinct assets of the city such as historical heritage, natural surroundings, home grown silk industry. A need was also expressed to have a strategy for conserving natural assets. The proposal has managed to link broader vision and knitted it well throughout the initial section.

AREA BASED DEVELOPMENT
â€¢ The summary section is generic and will need to be detailed, providing description of the strategies proposed to be adopted for area development along with the specifics of the area chosen for intervention.
â€¢ It is recommended that the components of ABD be detailed further to justify the costs provided in the financial section. For example, the extent of housing for the poor in terms of coverage, locations etc. is not provided.
â€¢ The overall proposal has largely become an exercise in developing key street sections with pedestrianization and greening of edges. Only the River front development seems to have been detailed to an extent.
â€¢ The proposal had a potential for revitalizing the entire ABD area and not just select urban edges.
â€¢ Proposes another plan (IIIP) for implementing convergence
â€¢ More focus on creating new basic infra less on smartness

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN
â€¢ No resolutions (HPSC/Local Body)
â€¢ Fall back plan says that new revenue generations from new taxes and collection of Property Tax will be used to facilitate escalated project costs, but on the other hand, in para 38 it is mentioned that the corporation is largely dependent on budgetary support.
â€¢ It is said that the SPV may monetize existing land banks available in different parts of the city to generate revenue streams either through lease or PPP. But no detailing of such land is provided.
â€¢ No concrete structure of SPV has been given.
â€¢ SPV is viewed as O&M agency
â€¢ The Structure explained in the proposal is generic and repetition of SCM guidelines with no inputs from the city.
â€¢ The Implementation Plan needs more clarity with regard to timelines.

FINANCIAL PLAN
â€¢ The resource plan is very generic in nature. No break- up has been given, therefore it is not feasible to analyse the resource plan.
â€¢ Setting up Command Centre and Intelligent TMS under PPP is also does not look feasible as both the activities do not attract any revenue. Similarly in case of Open spaces and Landscaping under PPP the source of fee is O&M of SWM, STP and WTP which does not appear to be correlated.
â€¢ The total proposal is generalised and not backed by any fiscal data

Shillong SCP Observations

CITY LEVEL CRITERIA
â€¢ In the sections on 'quality of life' the city has largely described the infrastructure available or projects being undertaken. The descriptions do not provide a clear picture of the level of services. It is recommended that the descriptions include service levels or indicators.
â€¢ Identified strategies look disintegrated and it could not be correlated with the outcome of city assessment and SWOT Analysis.
â€¢ Goals identified are not equally vetted as per the evolved vision.

AREA BASED DEVELOPMENT
â€¢ No statistics available for selection of area for ABD. Important to include such information at least in Annexure 3.
â€¢ The overall section is full of general descriptions and does not provide specifics of any of the components proposed. For instance, under 'components' the urban infrastructure paragraph is a good illustration of the lack of specifics.
â€¢ Although the components section also mentions enhancement of economic opportunities, it is not clear how this is specifically proposed to be achieved.
â€¢ The lack of detail is evident even in the itemized costs provided under the financial section.
â€¢ At a more fundamental level, it would be important for the proposal to respond more sensitively to the specific city and site context. Presently the proposal reads like a generic service improvement plan.
â€¢ Maps are completely missing from the proposal and hence there is no way of spatially understanding the various components listed in the ABD proposal. Even the actual delineation of the selected area has not been provided.
â€¢ It is recommended that all sections be revised and made more specific.

PAN CITY SOLUTIONS
â€¢ More details will be need in order to understand interventions such as bicycle sharing system and enhancement of parking capacity. Bike sharing for instance in the demand assessment section indicates that bike sharing stands will be created. This involves procurement and infrastructure creation and may not be permissible. Similarly cycling tracks will also require creation of infrastructure.
â€¢ Overall pan-city proposal looks conceptually more promising than the ABD, with most elements listed in the descriptions. However the proposal needs to still be more specific in terms of numbers, coverage etc.

FINANCIAL PLAN
â€¢ The FOP is not clear it is very generalized and not backed by any figures. Similar is the issue with Fall Back options which needs to be more precise

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN
â€¢ State passed a resolution that they will only support SCM if the sharing is 90:10
No resolution by ULB for SPV

Namchi SCP Observations

City level Criteria
â€¢ Specific details about the administrative and human resource capacity enhancement measures taken need to be mentioned to establish the implementation potential of the city
â€¢ Identified strategy looks disintegrated and it could not be correlated with the outcome of city assessment and SWOT Analysis.
â€¢ Linkages needs to be drawn and presented for strategic focus ideas and strategic blueprint interventions
â€¢ Assets creation and enhancement for improvement include casinos, proposed to be taken up by private sector or under PPP, is there a legal provision to recommend such activities?
â€¢ Goals need to be strengthened as per vision envisaged (all aspects of vision are not covered within the goals listed) and mapped either with strategic focus ideas or strategic blueprint interventions to bring in the continuity (otherwise strategic blueprint is carried forward)
â€¢ Mode composition highlights high usage of cars and the breakup excludes NMT which needs to be captured within the same metrics to see the actual pattern of modal share
â€¢ What are the metrics for establishing that 80 percent of citizens have participated in citizen engagement process? as the self assessment indicates citizen participation with select stakeholders under scenario 2
â€¢ Timeline of citizen engagement indicate activities running until last week of November for vision statement competition, how was this incorporated into SCP with only 20 days for completion?

Area Based Development
â€¢ Idea of ABD needs to be clearly articulated and summarized including type of development chosen, extent of area proposed and some of the key interventions
â€¢ Project Axis talks about celebration of "national democracy" in the "Ecohabita"ofNamchi. What does this mean?
â€¢ Project Axis includes demolition of old built structures and construction of new buildings, details and location ?
â€¢ ABD proposal has too many components and sub components with visuals of before & after, the range varies from component to component with boundary wall construction in project axis to cable car installation in project movers, with no clear strategy for convergence these need to be revisited. Techno-Economic assessment of the major projects.
â€¢ ABD doesn"t address the change in assumption scenario for three most significant factors
â€¢ Aspects related to measurable impact, scale and replication are also not addressed in ABD in detail considering the scope presented in schematic drawings
â€¢ ABD components need to be mapped to city vision and goals to ensure their compatibility

Pan City Proposal

â€¢ Pan city proposal is a complex combination of delivery of services and use of technology to support the delivery and needs to be simplified for better planning and implementation
â€¢ In spite of 75 percent consent, presenting risk of denial from citizens to the increase in user charge questions the citizen engagement process of pan city proposal and also readiness of city in implementing it
â€¢ Considering the complexity of pan city proposal nature, risk identification exercise needs to be done in detail
â€¢ Pan city proposal doesn"t address the change in assumption scenario for three most significant factors
â€¢ The timeline to see the benefits of the pan city proposal is not mapped to its components

Implementation Plan
â€¢ Although varied programmes are identified for convergence, it lacks detailing and readiness of the city in implementation
â€¢ Instead of convergence implementation strategies, details about SPV are mentioned
â€¢ Risks identified include denial of citizens to pay higher user charges, this needs to be ascertained with an in-principle agreement from citizen groups and relevant market associations
â€¢ The wide range of components proposed in ABD need technical capacities, and with limited resources within Namchi the SCP is dependent on external resources
â€¢ Convergence of pan city proposal with ongoing and proposed projects need to be detailed and should be supported with documental evidence
â€¢ Date of completion is not mentioned for any of the components and is linked with commencement of project
â€¢ Resources required for implementation plan need to be elaborated and linked with relevant agencies
â€¢ An activity prioritization plan needs to be prepared to ensure timely completion of activities

Financial Plan
â€¢ Considering the capacity constraints and financial status of Namchi, generating Rs. 175.5 Crore under PPP could be challenging
â€¢ Expectations of generating additional revenue from ABD area residents through increase property tax charges is ambitious and needs to be addressed through citizen group consensus
â€¢ Financial Timeline is not mentioned for any of the components and is linked with implementation of project

Port Blair SCP Observations

CITY LEVEL CRITERIA
â€¢ The earlier sections are reasonably detailed, including the SWOT analysis which indicates several potential areas for intervention − issues regarding basic services, unsustainable growth and sprawl, power issues, pollution and threat to marine ecology, enormous tourism potential etc.
â€¢ Lack of good internet network has also been flagged as a critical hurdle in implementing online governance measures.
â€¢ Some sections however need improvement. The vision statement presently includes too many aspects and reads more like a group of objectives. Needs to be more focused − will also help streamline and give form to the overall proposal.
â€¢ The self-assessment format needs to be revised since most answers under last column (inputs for achieving desired levels) are only focused on this specific smart city proposal. This needs to be a more general description of what would need to be done in the sector to achieve desired service levels.

AREA BASED DEVELOPMENT
â€¢ The ABD proposal does not seem to respond to the various themes that emerged from the SWOT. The end product largely focuses only on provision of basic services. While this is important, it would be critical for the proposal to respond more sensitively to the specific city and site context. Unique potential for the city to explore and demonstrate a planning model for sustainable development given its context.
â€¢ The presentation of the proposal will also need improvement. The ABD summary needs to be specific to the interventions proposed in Port Blair and should not be a generic discussion. Similarly, more detailing of all subcomponents should be included in the 'components' section so as to adequately justify costs stated in the financial section.
â€¢ Setting up of a singular solar plant at a greenfield location (key map on pg. 3 of annexure 3) cannot be considered as greenfield development project. In fact since the entire amount is coming from convergence it need not be cited as an ABD proposal at all.
â€¢ Certain tourism projects such as Oceanarium and water sports complex listed under components of SCM are completely being funded under other initiatives and hence should not be mentioned as directly under SCM. It may be vital for the city to consider adding new proposals for tourism, waterfront development etc.
â€¢ Over dependence on convergence as a strategy − SCP only being used as augmentation funds in most cases to existing projects. A large number of projects are designed as add-ons for filling gaps in funding under different missions. This presents a substantial risk.
â€¢ The final proposal only looks at an SCP value of 425 crores. Given the number of issues faced by the city and the enormous potential for intervention, this does not seem to be justified. Several issues and theme areas remain unexplored.

PAN CITY SOLUTIONS
â€¢ Laying of underground cables would qualify under creation of new infrastructure and may not be permissible under pan city solutions.
â€¢ In fact the proposal depends upon laying of underwater optical fiber between Chennai-Port Blair and this may present a large risk to project completion.

FINANCIAL PLAN
â€¢ FOP is only looks at GOI grants and loans from HUDCO/NABARD. However, detailed figures for resources from each source are missing in the answer.
â€¢ The proposal is also silent on operations of SPV's financial sustainment.
â€¢ Credit worthiness is also not disclosed, as the same will be needed for attracting loans or private investments.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

â€¢ There is no income projected for SPV. In the absence of SPV's own revenue, what will be the source funds to meet SPV's O&M expenses e.g. Salary, etc. Most of the O&M expenses are proposed to be met by budget allocation or intangible gains. But how the funds will be mobilized to meet such expenses, the finance plan is silent on the same.
â€¢ Fall back plan says that in the worst case scenario, certain projects that are identified for funding through SCM funds would be withdrawn. This raises serious doubt on the intention of the authorities to implement the SCM as a whole.

Diu SCP Observations

CITY PROFILE:
â€¢ SWOT analysis is very weak with a lot of repetitions.
â€¢ The Strategic focus and blueprint is very generic for a sustainable city with a focus on sustainable infrastructure and does not establish any specific linkages with the SWOT.
â€¢ Only 8% of the households were covered during surveys.

AREA-BASED PROPOSAL:
â€¢ The area based proposal does not clearly demarcate any specific area for the area based proposal. It rather proposes projects scattered all over the ULB area.
â€¢ It lacks a single comprehensive plan with clear defined targets. The plan provided in the annexure merely enlists proposed building projects.
â€¢ The attached images of the proposed building projects lack the coherence of being part of a unified area development plan.
â€¢ Although water supply has been limited, the development of water theme parks especially in an ecologically sensitive area is a mismatch. Also while Diu is known for its built and environmental heritage resources, the introduction of a water theme park can be reconsidered.
â€¢ The component on tourism/conservation of heritage assets focuses on more on provision of tourism related infrastructure like parking, food courts, and recreational facilities. There is no focus on built and cultural heritage.
â€¢ There is a complete absence of environment conservation especially since Diu belongs to a highly ecologically sensitive region.

PAN CITY PROPOSAL
â€¢ With poor internet connectivity as mentioned in the SWOT, the pan city proposal based on high speed internet connectivity is a mismatch.
â€¢ Contents of "Approach and Methodology" are same for Area Based and Pan-City proposals.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN
â€¢ While the implementation plan, scenarios (short, medium and long term) and the timeline provided are inconsistent. For example, the Optical Fibre Cable, crucial for internet connectivity would be completed in February 2018, which is a medium term scenario, this has however been listed as a short term scenario.
â€¢ Also in terms of timelines, creation of wi-fi zones, information kiosks and citizen information centres would be completed 15 - 18 months prior to the laying of the optical fibre cables and improved public services delivery system

FINANCIAL PLAN:
Financial plan is not adequately detailed out.

Oulgaret SCP Observations

City level Criteria
â€¢ Specific details about the SMS/Whatsapp based monitoring initiative under administrative efficiency and how this can be scaled to robust IT based service need to be mentioned to establish the implementation potential of the city
â€¢ Strengths include data centers, connectivity, facilitation centers but the self assessment indicates IT for government services under scenario 2 clearly indicating a mismatch
â€¢ Good storm water drain system but sewerage system yet to cover in most parts
â€¢ SCP vision - vibrant, enduring and green economic inclusive growth city - simplify the statement and define linkage between goals identified and vision envisaged
â€¢ Vision, themes and sub themes mentioned in annexure 3 are different from the SCP document, this needs to be streamlined
â€¢ Slum population in the city and their inclusion in SCP is acknowledge in citizen engagement but their priorities and aspirations are not mentioned anywhere

Area Based Development
â€¢ The basis for ABD prioritization and DSS for ABD selection is biased and skewed (criteria needs to be redefined)
â€¢ ABD area selected is predominantly industrial area earmarked by Pondicherry Industries Promotion Development and Investment Corporation (with settlements in plan shown)
â€¢ ABD area is outside the city municipal corporation limit, considering out of 24 smart city features, 12 are in scenario 2 and 3 are in scenario 1 for the existing city area the rationale for opting Greenfield development is logical

Pan City Proposal
â€¢ Pan city solution is presented as a need identified from city profiling but city profile suggest contrary (The crime rate of 2.18/1000 persons during 2013 has decreased to 2.04 in 2015. Crime & Criminal Tracking Network & Systems has been launched in the U.T. of Puducherry)

Implementation Plan
â€¢ Limited capacity of urban local body to support and steer the SCP implementation
â€¢ Land tenure and approvals?

Financial Plan
â€¢ Nearly 75 percent of funds from PPP concessionaires with payback for four PPP funded components to be completed between 13-15 years (how does the existing city benefit from this proposal?)
â€¢ Financial Plan outlay is very high (especially considering the city size and impact to existing city)

Silvassa SCP Observations

CITY LEVEL CRITERIA
â€¢ City profile lacks in analysis in terms of present condition, merely providing data of particular services. It is recommended to include service levels or indicators. Some details on initiatives such as SaralSevaKendras and SamaySudhiniSeva can also be provided.
â€¢ Objective metrics need to be included in the self-evaluation sheet. In several cases the linkage between measures proposed and outcomes mentioned is also weak. For example, water supply − given that only 5% of households have water connections and the rest depend upon ground water, it won't be possible to augment to 24X7 supply by just doing metering, smart pumping and GIS.
â€¢ Vision has been evolved to develop Silvassa as a sustainable, balanced and connected city. However, SCP doesn't explain how overall aspiration and goals for the city to achieve the vision in next 5-10 years.

AREA BASED DEVELOPMENT
â€¢ Numerical/ statistical data on actual coverage of citizens during citizen engagement process is missing. The entire section is largely descriptive.
â€¢ The ABD proposal is largely focused on provision of services, which is understandable given the lack of it. However, the proposal lacks strength in terms of exploration of aspects such as industrial potential or tourism potential, which were highlighted in the SWOT analysis.
â€¢ A large number of the interventions are directly dependent upon convergence with existing projects of other departments or those under other missions. This presents a certain level of risk. For example, last mile water connectivity proposed as an intervention under ABD is dependent upon improvement in network under AMRUT. However, SLIPs are presently being prepared and are not yet approved under the AMRUT mission.
â€¢ City has proposed 624 acres of land for retrofitting. However, clarification of area demarcation for retrofit development in terms of its location within the surroundings and functions, are not adequately spelled out in the proposal.
â€¢ SCP lacks in correlation between identified project components with the evolved vision and objectives.
â€¢ SCP inadequately described smart characteristics of the proposed development in selected area that could transform and explore different interfaces with land use (mixed land use) characteristics, open space system and walk-ability.
â€¢ The absence of conceptual plan/illustrations with proposed development, SCP could not provide a better understanding of its proposed activities. Also, SCP does not specify the proposed retrofit development activities with reference to its location (within the ABD).
â€¢ Besides this approach where the city has largely tried to develop smaller interventions as layers on existing projects/missions has also led to lack of full exploration of the possibilities under this separate mission. This is evident from the fact that the largest cost component under the project is creation of utility ducts (around 300 crores) with the rest coming in the form of smaller interventions (including IT-based) on projects under other missions.
â€¢ As an extension to the earlier point, the proposal shows no focus on re-planning or redeveloping proposed area in terms of compacting densities, mixed land use etc. which can become a paradigm for future growth. Given that the proposal is expected to affect 50% of the population (area profile) this intervention if fully explored can be a great opportunity for doing so.
â€¢ Presentation and description of the proposal is also lacking in several departments. First, plans do not show any details of proposed interventions, particularly transport interventions such as pedestrian streets and so on. Difficult to understand extent of interventions, their location and coverage spatially.
â€¢ Second, the text descriptions in main proposal are also lacking. For example, points 1, 2 and 5 under 'Smart Urban Form' are descriptions of components of the ABD and not the proposed changes to urban form. The proposal description needs strengthening in all key sections such as components, risk matrix and smart urban form.

PAN CITY SOLUTIONS
â€¢ The SWM solution seems to include installation of new infrastructure such as treatment machines and this may not qualify (installing new infrastructure should not be included).
â€¢ Also the interventions have not been fully explored, the smart poles intervention for instance seems uni-dimensional only providing wifi. This could be explored further in terms of data sensors and used for transport solutions across the city, for pollution or air quality indicators etc. Actual implementation of smart cards has not been detailed adequately.
â€¢ The risk matrix is quite generic and does not present a serious analysis of the possible risks that could derail the projects. Also the convergence section needs to be examined for errors, for instance, integration with AMRUT for waste collection is not feasible since this sector is outside the mission mandate.

FINANCIAL PLAN
â€¢ The total SCM plan is for Rs. 839 cores which can be funded from SCM grants. However, looking at meagre internal revenues, the sustainability will be a big issue.
â€¢ Though the proposal speaks of improvement in revenues from internal sources, however, the same is not backed up by facts and figures.
â€¢ Fall back options given are only narrative and lack facts and figures

Imphal SCP Observations

CITY LEVEL CRITERIA
â€¢ Vision evolved based on the historical background of the city. However, vision statement given is not self explanatory and doesn't explain how overall aspiration and goals to achieve the overall vision.
â€¢ Focus on creating infrastructure without linking to vision and strategy

AREA BASED DEVELOPMENT
â€¢ City identifies retrofitting of 541 acres as a contiguous block combining Core area, DM college campus and Kangla Fort. However, identified project components are very much subjective in nature where it does not quantifies the requirement. (e.g in terms of length, location and numbers.
â€¢ SCP doesn't conceptualize or emphasize how the proposed development will improve the CBD area along with the Kangla Fort area.
â€¢ Item wise essential features for area-based plan are inadequately discussed. List of essential features to be incorporated in area-based development is also not included.

PAN CITY PROPOSAL
â€¢ Integrated Public Transport, Road geometry and junction design, Multi level car parking, Solar Energy Park are considered as Pan-city solution components. Some of the solution could have taken within ABD proposals as show case to replicate other parts of the city.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN
â€¢ ABP proposal seems to be week and inept to drive a major economic or social change in the city. There are no clear linkages between both ABP and PCP. PCP proposal need in depth study of the city''s mobility and energy consumption culture if it has to earn good results.

FINANCIAL PLAN
â€¢ The resource plan is not very specific. The ULB proposes to contribute around Rs. 298 crores from own resources, whereas the income of its resources is only Rs. 26.7 crores.
â€¢ For O&M recovery an increase of 13% is envisaged in Taxes/Fees which appears to be too ambitious

Ranchi SCP Observations

City level Criteria
â€¢ Significant weaknesses in provision of basic services (roads, public transport, healthcare, sewerage management system)
â€¢ Knowledge/education/higher education hub is repeatedly put across as an strength, weakness (lack of) and opportunity. Seems like the city agency has committed to this model but there is no mention of surrounding ecosystem required to support it.
â€¢ Knowledge hub gets repeated in strategic focus, while other problem areas in urban services are completely ignored , except ITS for transportation and solid waste management. ITS wont accrue benefits if not backed by sufficient public transportation network, this is missed in strategic focus.
â€¢ Knowledge hub gets repeated in the city vision and goals. No mention on the overall vision for the city in urban services and quality of life. Limited understanding of mobility (use of ITS /cameras to improve mobility without addressing car ownership and congestion, parking , public transportation, NMT).
â€¢ The city has serious deficiencies in self assessment urban indicators (mostly at level 1 and 2). Importantly the ingredients essential for a knowledge economy (students, young professionals) such as NMT, mixed land use, public transportation, cultural and recreational hallmarks such as theatre, libraries etc., walkability, rental housing are abysmally low in the existing city.
â€¢ All listed goals have strategies, no measurable (quantitative and qualitative) outcomes
â€¢ Main reason given is this project is essential to retain younger demographic. Yet economy and employment which is a main retaining factor in developing knowledge hub does not figure in strategic focus areas.
â€¢ Citizen engagement process describes strategies but no quantitative outcomes (such as which priority areas received what percentage of votes, how many women voted etc).
o While city problem areas and smart city advocacy was done extensively through non ICT methods (street plays, kiosks etc), the model (redevelopment, retrofitting or greenfield) and the site prioritization was done on MyGov and 85000 surveys were distributed through ward councillors.
o What was the total number of votes polled for area selection (both MyGov and ward surveys)?

Area Based Development
â€¢ 341 acres of greenfield development.
â€¢ More explanation on how city problems will be addressed by the ABD proposal.
â€¢ All features included within the greenfield development but no public transportation corridor to connect to the city.
â€¢ The city has low amount of public spaces so a greenway for bicycle connecting the city and the campus would work for improving mobility and augment the public spaces for the city
â€¢ How can greenfield development (with no development/residents) be converged with AMRUT, SBM and other mentioned missions? Has this been included and sanctioned in SAAP and SLIP for AMRUT in the current financial year?
â€¢ Convergence implementation mentions these will be converged in future (uncertain)
â€¢ Market risks are too high and project sustainability needs to be relooked at. Knowledge hubs are better when integrated within the existing city (NYC, London etc) unless there is a good presence of national and international educational institutes to bring in the students.
â€¢ Spatial impact might be disastrous without a public transportation link similar to Amity, Noida. Social impact will be non inclusionary since only private institutions have been mentioned to be approached (Why not IITs, IIMs, AIIMS etc especially with a goal to attract international talen)

â€¢ Specifically mentions "not to be viewed as real estate development" in the city goals?

Pan City Proposal
â€¢ ITMS proposal serves private car owners. Need further enrichments such as ITS for bus, bicycle and pedestrian signal prioritization, possibly odd-even and HOV (high occupancy vehicle) lanes, parking reform (pricing) etc.
â€¢ Advocacy for behavior change needs to compliment the enforcement and regulation. ICT for SWM should also incorporate public advocacy, currently not incorporated. Current emphasis only on enforcement and regulation.
â€¢ IOT sensor technology will need skilled control centers for traffic routing . Currently capacity to manage these systems is doubtful so explanation is needed.
â€¢ Both projects are reasonable fits to the city needs but not necessarily inclusive. Questions remain whether SWM through ICT will be extended to all households including slums (always an issue in Indian cities) . Similarly should an ICT solution focus on speeding up cars and reduce their speed as an deterrent to vehicular travel.

Implementation Plan
â€¢ Only infrastructure will be developed within ABD proposal by 2018. No details on when the first institute will be operational. That is dependent on the market, uncertain.

Financial Plan
â€¢ Total cost of Rs 6680 crores, which is about 12 times the annual expenditure of RMC and 18 times the annual income of RMC in 2011-12 (Official info).
â€¢ Private investment is projected at Rs 4833 crores, doubtful with a credit rating BB- (Official Info)
â€¢ JNNURM performance is quite low (30% of work completed and 24% of funds utilised in 2012 - official info)

Agartala SCP Observations

CITY LEVEL CRITERIA
â€¢ With five strategic objectives, the vision of city is to become livable place which has efficient urban transport system and sustainable environmental conditions.

AREA BASED DEVELOPMENT
â€¢ SCP has identified an area of 61.60 acres of land in GB road area and AkhauraGolChakkar selected for Redevelopment. Area has been selected in two different locations with an area of 32.6 and 29 acres. As per the Guidelines, any redevelopment has to be done on an area of more than 50 acres. Though the guidelines permit plan in "contiguous" areas.
â€¢ ABD has no linkage with vision and strategy.
â€¢ SCP lacks in conceptualization of the selected area for re-development. In both the area where redevelopment process will be undertaken but the plan is not adequately spelled out how these area will improve and solution provided are really improve the situation.
â€¢ This proposal describes the project as pilot project to provide affordable, sustainable and safe environment for social and economic development of residents of the area.
â€¢ Need Master plan and development plan as pre-requisite before implementation.
â€¢ There is no clarity on rehabilitation of existing slum dwellers---different viewpoints are placed in different parts of proposal

PAN CITY PROPOSAL
â€¢ Pan city solution proposed are basically to upgrade existing transportation with improved traffic management plan includes E-ticketing, smart bus shelters and GPS enabled vehicle tracking and Wi-fi in public places linked with safety equipments. 4 MW solar energy farm is another project which will ensure energy supply that is clean in nature.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN
â€¢ Land availability is still not ascertained even though it is mentioned that it is government land.
â€¢ No resolution for approval of SCP and SPV annexed. Only broad deliberations were annexed
â€¢ Institutional capacities to handle complex projects and inter departmental coordination could be potential barrier. The development activity will require land, the non-cooperation from the land owners could jeopardize the land availability.

FINANCIAL PLAN
The resource plan for total SCM plan for Rs.3249.20 crores appears to very ambitious. In answer to Q.38, the resource plan only offers resources in narrative without backing of facts and figures. The FOP needs to be very specific for such a massive proposed Investment.

Kohima SCP Observations

CITY LEVEL CRITERIA
â€¢ Description City Profile Lacks in presenting the existing condition and periodical progress have not been shown.
â€¢ Strategies evolved to achieve Vision to develop the as a regional transit hub for Asian Countries does not support it. The Plan proposals have not even suggested any actions towards developing the city as a regional transit hub.
â€¢ No linkages with vision.

AREA BASED DEVELOPMENT
â€¢ Area-based development comprises retrofitting and redevelopment of 359 acres of core city area. SCP doesn't specify and make it clear how much area (acres) is identified for redevelopment.
â€¢ SCP does not provide much insight to the overall concept of re-development and retrofit development in the city.

â€¢ Components proposed for Area-based Plan is inadequately discussed. Projects identified are not location specific. Proposals for redevelopment of City centre is also not described properly.
â€¢ Proposals of E-Governance including Control Center, Wi-Fi hotspots, optical fibre network, FIR kiosks, Passenger Information System, Incident & Grievance Redressal System, Common Mobility Card, RFID/GPS vehicles, could have taken under Pan-City solution instead of taking altogether into Area-based proposal .

PAN CITY PROPOSAL
â€¢ Pan-City solutions suggested are inadequately perceived. SCP has proposed to create infrastructures instead of application of selected Smart Solutions to the existing. Proposed infrastructures are smart bus terminal, bicycle lanes, smart bus stops. It is not clear from the SCP whether, these are existing infrastructure. Pan-City proposal should be an application of Smart Solutions using technology, information and data to make infrastructure and services better.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN
â€¢ Proposal does not fit in with the vision of developing the city as a Trans-national Transit Hub- no mention of upgrading/creating regional transportation infrastructures/ logistics park/ warehousing/ others.
â€¢ Proposal is not cohesive with the existing tourism and related handicraft sector/ no link mentioned with Hornbill/ other festivals/ rural infrastructure.
â€¢ Very sketchy proposal. Made council as SPV.
â€¢ SPV resolution signed by Administrator
â€¢ MOUs providing "No objection" by various departments on some broad areas
FINANCIAL PLAN

â€¢ The plan proposes to raise Rs. 591.42 crores from Convergence and PPP.
â€¢ The ULB has no loan capacity therefore, PPP projects can only be successful if they are planned under revenue models.
â€¢ More over there is Property Tax, and ULB proposes to levy betterment tax as PT by changing its name, which is not understood as both are different taxes levied for different purposes.

Aizawl SCP Observations

City level Criteria
â€¢ SWOT analysis shows lack of source of funding (self and external) as a weakness and huge existing gap in demand and supply of local infrastructure. SWOT matrix is too complex to understand.
â€¢ Vision of the city should be upfront for outreach and advocacy.
â€¢ All listed goals have strategies, no measurable (quantitative and qualitative) outcomes
â€¢ Only strategies and methodologies defined in citizen participation No quantification or metrics to denote inclusion of all sects of society (Refer to Solapur plan). Also no outcomes (issues identified and percentages)
â€¢ The city has to select a number for existing level in self assessment. Makes it easier it to understand. Electricity and Energy supply is rated at level 3 and the PCP proposes this as a city wide proposal. Would it make sense to rather pick up a more deficient service area in PCP ?

Area Based Development
â€¢ 734 acres out of which 576 is retrofitting and 158 is for greenfield development for a new government complex.
â€¢ No GIS basemap found for ABD. Only topographical contour map found so very difficult to visualize (Please refer to Bhubaneshwar plan)
â€¢ The cost breakup is reversed(1:5). Would be advisable to focus on retrofitting especially with low capacities in budgeting and financial resource management.
â€¢ If the greenfield development is still seen as necessary, it should be tied into an economic need (high tech renewable energy cluster that city proposes for PCP) or a social need (housing, education, health, open spaces) rather than a government complex.
â€¢ The greenfield development for government complex doesn"t address mandatory requirement for EWS/LIG housing , this requirement is rather addressed as a part of the entire ABD.
â€¢ Convergence agenda misses Housing For All mission.
â€¢ Measurable impact needs some quantification (Refer to Pune plan)

Pan City Proposal
â€¢ Demand assessment is not specific. It talks about the twelfth schedule and list of obligatory duties. (Please refer to Pune plan)
â€¢ Inclusion section weakly crafted. Estimates about number of jobs generated and savings by moving to LED street lighting and solar energy on government buildings can better help describe the inclusive impact on the society.
â€¢ Risks about landslides in both PCP and ABD emphasize "Concerned Department" to map out high risk zones. Please identify the department (internal and external) to get it done on priority (Seismic 5 zone).
â€¢ From the risk identification , the issues concerning Seismic zone 5 don"t seem to have been addressed till now. All policy decisions are still to be taken. Major concern
â€¢ Convergence implementation shows national solar mission to cover rooftop panels and LED street lighting. What is the Smart City funding of Rs 840 crores used for?

Implementation Plan
â€¢ Implementation plan has to be specific with likely date of completion. Need to be put baseline indicators to understand the current situation. No implementation timelines for PCP?
â€¢ Lot of explanation given in Scenarios section but no schedule or pert chart given. Not acceptable.
â€¢ Roles in convergence very general (Refer to Pune plan)
â€¢ Official Information shows only 5 functions transferred from the 74th CAA. Serious issue about the capacity that needs to be

verified and addressed.

Financial Plan
â€¢ Itemized costs do not add up to the total cost. Area based development cost total does not match sum of retrofitting and greenfield.
â€¢ Revenue income for ULB is 2.42 crores in 2014. The SCP estimates Rs 1600 crores needed including O&M. Major concern about viability
Too dependent on central transfers.

Kavaratti SCP Observations

CITY LEVEL CRITERIA
â€¢ SCP Report attempted city's efforts to improve the present situation. Island could have also adequately highlighted both internal by roads and water and external connectivity through by Air and Sea from the mainland to the island.

â€¢ Vision evolved for the city is to develop as zero carbon footprint city which providing for adequate water supply, specialized health facility & green energy. However, strategic goals identified to achieve the vision need more synchronization. Strategic Goals shall be more logically supporting as well as objectively achieve the overall vision.

AREA BASED DEVELOPMENT
â€¢ Area-based development comprises 750 acres of land considered for retrofitting. SCP does not provide much insight to the overall concept of retrofit development in the island city.
â€¢ SCP envisions to focuses the island city as a Solar City. Augmentation of Solar Power generation from existing 760KW to 6MW (5MW through PPA and 1MW through Individual roof tops. However, the concept note presented along with the SCP has not provided steps and targets set in order to realize it.
â€¢ Identified project components should have more innovative and selected out of best practices adopted in other island cities of the world.
â€¢ Portions copied from Diu proposal
â€¢ Making a hospital and ship will not make city smart
â€¢ Missed the tourism opportunity

PAN CITY PROPOSAL
â€¢ City suggested Smart Electrical metering with AMR as part of Pan-city solution. IT solution such as V-sat based connectivity (hub) at Kavaratti, Network Operations Centre at, Kavaratti could have suggested an integrated IT solution.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN
â€¢ Impact of climate change and possibility of natural disasters could be a potential barrier in timely and as per plan execution of ABD proposal
â€¢ Administrative approvals considering the status as UT, fragile ecology and strategic importance for defence forces could lead to delay in execution of projects
â€¢ Lack of technical expertise and capacities to manage and execute may lead to over dependence on external agencies and could be a potential barrier

FINANCIAL PLAN
â€¢ There is on source of revenue and everything is dependent on GOI grants.
â€¢ Reforms need to be undertaken for sustainability
â€¢ Itemised costs for all components of the ABD proposal are presented whereas for the Pan city total costs are mentioned
â€¢ Resource for nearly 51 percent of the SCP costs are to be generated from Smart City Funds by GoI.
â€¢ SCP is based on allocation of resources from GoI and its sustainability depends upon identification of additional external sources of funding and commitment

Dehradun SCP Observations

City level Criteria
â€¢ The potential of the city identified as part of SWOT include forest products contribution to the economy at 43 percent, large and medium industries turnover around 240cr but there is no linkage established between proposed ABD project with exception of rental public housing for low income group
â€¢ Although the identification of weakness include strong dependence on tourism, lack of core infrastructure, and growing slum population the proposed Greenfield development plan fails to highlight the positive impact of this on city region economy and quality of life.
â€¢ Eco tourism opportunities, development of woolen industry, sericulture, nursery development, medicinal plants, potential of Dehradun as entry point to tourism sites in Himalayan region, logistics and warehousing hub identified as part of SWOT need to be further explored.
â€¢ There is a lack of consistency between the statements within SWOT analysis with cases like tourist population being seen as a threat rather than an opportunity for bringing in more revenue (eg. Malaysian tourism strategy of ensuring tourists spend more time at tourists spot so that the rate of transactions are high especially international)
â€¢ The assumption of development/introduction of education institutes of high repute will ensure retaining of school student communities within the region needs to be substantiated with the perception survey
â€¢ Strategic blueprint include tourism development as one key component but is limited to provision of online information services which is widely available in public domain (via travel websites, crowd sourcing websites etc.). This needs to be scaled up or unique elements needs to be introduced to ensure its sustainability

Area based Development

â€¢ With the potential strategic areas as education, tourism and forest products based economy - Dehradun SCP doesn''t acknowledge the options for ABD in terms of hotel management institutes, tourism institutes, culinary institutes etc. (with convergence from Ministry of Tourism at Central/State level)

â€¢ The alarming gap between number of schools and colleges available for higher education needs to be studied based on survey on existing student community (clearly identifying the percentage of non local students enrolled in Dehradun institutes)

â€¢ Proposed ABD project need to also look into smart infrastructure related to education, research and development and which can be complimentary to the knowledge hub idea (bringing in national and international knowledge networks, region specific cultural museums etc.)

â€¢ The urban form proposed in the area based development doesn''t reflect the site specific context and nature of development. Considering the ABD area as knowledge hub the urban form need to consider options like co-working spaces, start-up incubation centers, etc.

â€¢ Readiness of the city towards convergence is not evident from the strategies suggested for achieving convergence and supporting documentation provided.

â€¢ The components of Transit Oriented Development for higher and technical education as mentioned in SCP are not linked to the city strengths, opportunities and needs further detailing.

â€¢ The rationale for shortlisting/selection of TOD based development in Greenfield area is not presented in detail. Structure of the citizen feedback form presented as part of Annexure might have influenced the responses received. The choice of questions and response received are not context specific.

â€¢ Retrofitting, Redevelopment and Greenfield development options listed and the reasons for not considering are not mapped to any of the process in the document. In case of relocation and redevelopment of railway station area, riverfront development the reasons cited are pre-existing and should have thought of before presenting as options.

â€¢ ABD proposal suggests relocation of existing commercial and residential setups to the proposed Greenfield Township which is in contrast to the Smart Cities Mission of presenting ABD projects as light house project to other parts of the city and can be threat to local economy.

â€¢ Rental Public Housing for low income group is a smart planning intervention (eg. Singapore, Malaysia Public Housing Projects) but considering the tenure status of existing city of Dehradun (71 percent of housing is owned), the target needs to be established/identified.

â€¢ Readiness of the city in terms of land acquisition is limited as the risks identified include possibility of agitation from land owners, timeline for critical clearances pending, MoEF clearance which could be have initiated during the SCP preparation process.

â€¢ Risk mitigation strategies include enforcement of MoEF guidelines by State and random compliance check by MoEF which shows the city has not detailed the risk mapping, roles and responsibilities of different stakeholders.

â€¢ Smart features need to be aligned to the requirement of education/knowledge hub with detailing of components suggested like the "Eco-loop" in annexure is suggested

â€¢ The need for more number of car parks to ensure the success factor of transport infrastructure in ABD area contradicts the principle of Greenfield Development proposal i.e., walk to work. And also the fallback arrangement for delay in transportation network projects is proposed as PRT from ABD area to ISBT in Dehradun city which needs huge investment and can be financially not viable

â€¢ Investments and development of ABD project is largely dependent on Joint Venture and the strategic plan for showcasing the region as a prime location for investments by education economy institutes. This can be curtailed by collaborating with Indian and International market players in the field of hospitality management to ensure the financial model is sustainable.

â€¢ Considering the ABD is Greenfield project and not within the existing urban local government, the governance mechanism and replicability has limited scope within the city. Orientation of this project needs to be towards complimenting the existing city resources and giving it a platform for enhancing its economic opportunities.

â€¢ Dehradun city and surrounding region is an eco-sensitive region with rich biodiversity and cultural significance. ABD project should incorporate these principles into the design of public spaces, urban form and built infrastructure.

â€¢ Development of Greenfield areas with sizeable saleable component of floor areas for uses not directly related to the vision of the proposal presents the project as real estate project.

Pan City Proposal

â€¢ Integration of existing ERP system with the pan city solution is not detailed out in the SCP

â€¢ The frugal innovation of sharing economy concept (based on city of Kirklees) incorporated into the Dehradun pan city solution needs further detailing.

â€¢ The convergence plan of pan city solution needs further detailing with specifics about the components to be undertaken under various other initiatives, resource plan and implementation strategy.

Implementation Plan

â€¢ Details about current land tenure of the entire 2000 acre land in Greenfield area, disaster mitigation are not emphasized considering their priority in implementation of the project.

â€¢ Mapping the components eligible under the ABD and pan city solutions with the possible convergence sources needs to be detailed and necessary documentation regarding the achievement progress could enhance the credibility of the proposal

â€¢ IT based tool to ensure continuous convergence during and post implementation is an innovative tool. This needs to be aligned with the pan city solutions with access levels clearly defined so that incase any other crowd funding or other opportunities are available for city development, active citizens/citizen action groups can contribute

â€¢ Transactions related to agreement of land price and sale for 350 acres is presented in the SCP but location and adjacent property details are not mentioned in detail.

â€¢ Proposed ABD area is for 2000 acres and details about only land tenure, availability and timeline of acquisition is partially submitted.

â€¢ Good practices, challenges and investment strategies from international education hubs especially in Asia (eg. Hong Kong,

Taiwan, Singapore, Malaysia, South Korea) need to studied and localized.
â€¢ Pan city solution needs to detail out the existing level of quality communication infrastructure and plan for incremental increase to ensure the smooth transition of traditional public facilities to electronic platform.
â€¢ City services applications are available for various services individually and too complex design and moderate user experience can shift the prospective users of the Dehradun One App
â€¢ Information asymmetry between customer demands and service delivery capability needs to mapped for ensuring sustainability of the services.
â€¢ The design and development of the proposed TOD based Greenfield project can have positive impact on the micro climate if the proposed components like green buildings, maximum green cover, public transport and non motorized transport are implemented as per the required standards.
â€¢ Inclusive features of both ABD and Pan city proposal needs to be strengthened.
â€¢ As the needs Rashtriya Indian Military College is within the vicinity of the proposed Greenfield development, information related to security and safety clearances from Ministry of Defense and the list of permissible activities within the region needs to be established along with the height restrictions (if any).
â€¢ As the project is Greenfield all the area based development proposal components are anticipated to be completed in the year 2019 or later. This can have an unfavorable impact on implementation of the proposal for various reasons which include - national urban missions completion period is 2019, change in national urban agenda with National General Elections etc.
â€¢ Support documents showing willingness and interest from the knowledge partners identified in the governance structure needs to included.
â€¢ Representation of city government officials in SPV?

Finance Plan

Finance plan needs to be revised and strengthened as per the modifications in the above sections as the repayment is question

*****